The genetics of mate preferences in hybrids between two young and sympatric Lake Victoria cichlid species

Svensson, Ola; Woodhouse, Katie; van Oosterhout, Cock; Smith, Alan ; Turner, George; Seehausen, Ole

Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences

Published: 15/02/2017

Peer reviewed version

PROCEEDINGS B

The genetics of mate preferences in hybrids between two young and sympatric Lake Victoria cichlid species

Journal:	*Proceedings B*
Manuscript ID	RSPB-2016-2332.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Jan-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Svensson, Ola; University of Gothenburg, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences Woodhouse, Katie; Easton and Otley College van Oosterhout, Cock; University of East Anglia, School of Environmental Sciences Smith, Alan; University of Hull, Department of Biological Sciences Turner, George; Bangor University, School of Biological Sciences Seehausen, Ole; University of Bern, Aquatic Ecology and Evolution, Institute of Zoology
Subject:	Behaviour < BIOLOGY, Evolution < BIOLOGY, Genetics < BIOLOGY
Keywords:	Assortative mating, hybridization, Pundamilia nyererei, Pundamilia pundamilia, sensory drive, speciation-with-gene-flow
Proceedings B category:	Evolution

The genetics of mate preferences in hybrids between two young and sympatric Lake Victoria cichlid species

Ola Svensson12#, Katie Woodhouse13, Cock van Oosterhout14, Alan Smith1, George F Turner15*, Ole Seehausen67*

#Corresponding author: ola.svensson@bioenv.gu.se

*Equal contribution

1 School of Biological, Biomedical and Environmental Sciences, University of Hull, Hull HU6 7RX, UK

2 Present address: Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Gothenburg, Box 463, Gothenburg 405 30, Sweden

3 Present address: Easton and Otley College, Easton Campus, Easton, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

4 Present address: School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich NR9 5DX, UK

5 Present address: School of Biological Sciences, Bangor University, Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2UW, UK

6 Department of Fish Ecology and Evolution, EAWAG Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, Center for Ecology, Evolution and Biogeochemistry, Seestrasse 79, 6047 Kastanienbaum, Switzerland

7 Aquatic Ecology and Evolution, Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Bern, Baltzerstrasse 6, 3012 Bern, Switzerland

Abstract

The genetic architecture of mate preferences is likely to affect significant evolutionary processes, including speciation and hybridisation. Here, we investigate laboratory hybrids between a pair of sympatric Lake Victoria cichlid fish species that appear to have recently evolved from a hybrid population between similar predecessor species. The species demonstrate strong assortative mating in the lab associated with divergent male breeding colouration (red dorsum vs. blue). We show in a common garden experiment, using DNA-based paternity testing, that the strong female mate preferences among males of the two species are fully recovered in a large fraction of their F2 hybrid generation. Individual hybrid females often demonstrated consistent preferences in multiple mate choice trials (≥5) across a year or more. This result suggests that female mate preference is influenced by relatively few major genes or genomic regions. These preferences were not changed by experience of a successful spawning event with a male of the non-preferred species in a no-choice single-male trial. We found no evidence for imprinting in the F2 hybrids, although the F1 hybrid females may have been imprinted on their mothers. We discuss this nearly Mendelian inheritance of consistent innate mate preferences in the context of speciation theory.

Key words

Assortative mating, hybridization, *Pundamilia nyererei*, *Pundamilia pundamilia*, sensory drive, speciation-with-gene-flow

Introduction

Behavioural assortative mating is considered to play a significant role in the origin and maintenance of reproductive isolation among species [1, 2]. The rate of and constraints to the evolution of behavioural assortative mating is likely often influenced by the genetic architecture of mate preferences and the nature and strength of genetic and non-genetic influences, such as imprinting and experience. For example, modelling studies suggest that sympatric and parapatric speciation starting from a monomorphic population is more probable in cases where assortative mating or female preference among male courtship genotypes is influenced by relatively few genetic loci [3-5], although models starting from large standing variation may not have this constraint of preference architecture [6]. However, a small number of preference genes tends to facilitate speciation in many models of speciation with gene flow [7, 8]. Empirical studies of the genetics of species divergence in mating preferences are still rare. Some of the empirical results are consistent with few genes having a major effect on female assortative mating in cichlid fish and *Heliconius* butterflies [9-12]. In other systems, mostly insects, female choice appears to have a more quantitative genetic background [13-15].

The Lake Victoria rocky-shore cichlid fishes of the genus *Pundamilia* have emerged as a significant model system for the study of speciation, being representatives of a spectacular hyperdiverse, rapid adaptive radiation and being relatively tractable as a laboratory species for breeding and mate choice experiments [16, 17]. Following the completion of their genome sequence [18], the evolutionary history of focal populations in the south-east part of the lake has been reconstructed [19]. Analysis of genome-wide sequence data indicates that the species with red dorsum (*P.* 'nyererei-like') and blue (*P.* 'pundamilia-like') males at Python Island

have recently diverged in situ, following a period of massive introgression with resident *P. pundamilia* on the colonisation of the island by *P. nyererei* from elsewhere in the lake [19].

The *Pundamilia* species, like other haplochromine cichlid fishes, show strong sex role differentiation and associated sexual dimorphism: the smaller, cryptic females are mouthbrooders, caring for the offspring for several weeks, while the larger brightly coloured males defend territories and display to attract females, but play no part in rearing the offspring [20]. Such a breeding system is likely to generate strong sexual selection acting through male-male competition and female preference for male courtship traits [21]. Closely-related haplochromine species often differ markedly in male nuptial colour and it has been proposed that this is associated with divergent female mate preferences [22], which have been demonstrated in a number of experimental trials [23-25]. The resultant assortative mating between females with a certain preference and males expressing the corresponding trait may play a significant role in the maintenance and perhaps sometimes the origin of reproductive isolation among sympatric species [16].

In the *Pundamilia* red/blue system, increasing water depth is associated with differentiation in alleles at the long wavelength sensitive opsin gene (*LWS*), female preferences and male nuptial colour, and it is likely that the sensory environment along this microhabitat gradient has influenced divergence through a process of 'sensory drive' [26]. Of course, mating signals are often multimodal and subject to multivariate selection [27-29] which is most likely also the case in *Pundamilia* [16, 17, 30]. However, in the *Pundamilia* system, female preferences for male nuptial colouration – itself likely to be oligogenic [31] – appear to be necessary and sufficient for assortative mating [30, 32, 33].

In haplochromine cichlids, trait segregation in F2 hybrids has been shown for female preferences [9, 12], male nuptial colouration [12, 31, 34] and male attractiveness to parental species [33, 35]. This includes the *Pundamilia* system, where, furthermore, studies suggest an absence of physical linkage between male nuptial colour and female mate preference [36]. At Python Island, gene flow between the species is estimated to be ongoing [19]. Therefore, the observed strong linkage disequilibrium between male colour and female preference is likely to be maintained by divergent selection. A behavioural study on the second generation (F2) hybrid offspring of *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" and *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" crosses by Haesler and Seehausen [9] revealed that female mate preference has a genetic basis, and that there may be as few as 1 to 5 major genes that contribute to the variation in this trait. That study, however, used a behavioural assay to measure mate choice, which may not be entirely predictive of actual mating decisions. Here, we used a 'common garden' approach with full-contact spawnings to examine female mate choice decisions in first and second-generation hybrids (F1 and F2). Wild-type females were included as a control. We used molecular paternity determination to measure directly the mating decisions of females in the laboratory [24] and examined the repeatability (≥5 spawning decisions) of female mate choice over a year or more to estimate the segregation of mate preferences in the F2 hybrids of the sympatric sister species of *Pundamilia* from Python island. In contrast to Haesler and Seehausen [9], we examined if mate preferences are consistently maintained across many spawning events (the full cycle from spawning to egg maturation).

If female preference is a polygenic quantitative trait with an additive genetic basis, F2 hybrids preferences is expected to be distributed in a Gaussian-like fashion with few individuals expressing significant preferences in the tails of the distribution. In contrast, for a polygenic trait with strong dominance effects, the preference distribution of the F2 will be skewed

120 towards either end of the distribution [37-39]. On the other hand, if preferences are not
121 genetically determined, the preference distribution of F2 females is predicted to be more
122 uniform across F2 females given that individuals shared the same common environment.
123 However, in the case of gene flow, linkage disequilibrium between alleles in a polygenic trait
124 will be broken up by recombination [40, 41] and polygenic mating preferences will be
125 difficult to maintain under such conditions. Because ongoing gene flow and recombination
126 [17, 19, 26] have been shown in this young [19] species pair, and because differentiation in
127 polygenic mating preferences will be difficult to maintain under such conditions, we predicted
128 mate preferences to segregate as an oligogenic trait in a nearly Mendelian fashion.
129

130 **Methods**

131 *The experimental fish*

132 We used the sympatric sister species *Pundamilia* sp. "pundamilia-like" and *Pundamilia* sp.
133 "nyererei-like" (sensu Meier et al. [19]). These taxa show a striking difference in male nuptial
134 colours: *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" males are grey on the flanks between black vertical bars and
135 have a metallic blue spinous dorsal fin, whereas *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" are orange on the
136 dorsum, dorsal head surface and dorsal fin and yellow on the flanks between black vertical
137 bars. It is estimated that there is currently a low to moderate level of gene flow between the
138 taxa at Python Island (The effective number of haploid immigrants per generation [2Nm,
139 method: forward in time] is 0.7 from *P* . sp. "pundamilia-like" to *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" and
140 7.2 in the opposite direction [19]). Species differences in female mate choice and divergent
141 alleles at the *LWS* opsin gene are not completely fixed [17] and males with intermediate
142 colouration are found [26]. In contrast, at Makobe Island in the open lake the sympatric
143 species pair *P. pundamilia* and *P. nyererei* shows stronger genome-wide differentiation, is
144 more ecologically differentiated, intermediate phenotypes are not observed and no

mismatches have been reported between male colouration and *LWS* opsin allele [17, 19, 26]. Both species are diploid and have 22 chromosomes (2n=44) [18].

Wild-type females and two F1 hybrid families (one in each cross direction) used in the mate choice experiment were bred from wild-caught parents. The fry were raised in stock tanks until large enough to be tagged with an integrated transponder (PIT tag), to enable individual identification. Using microsatellite DNA parentage analyses, we concluded that the 15 *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" females originated from 3 wild mothers and 1 wild sire and the 6 *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" females from 3-6 wild mothers and 5 wild sires (electronic supplementary material, tables S3-S4).

The two F2 families used in the mate choice experiment were bred from a lab stock collected in 1992 [42]. The F1 families were bred from the second to third lab generation. The F2 generations were bred by holding one F1 male (no replacement, N=3) together with not more than 10 F1 females in the same aquarium. One F2 half-sib family (PN1-33) was bred from fish from two F1 families bred in 1999 from a female *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" x male *P.* sp. "nyererei-like", and vice versa. This was the same F2 family used by Haesler and Seehausen [9]. The F2 broods were kept separate and hence some broods in the electronic supplementary material figure S3 may have had the same mother, whereas we know which of the two males was the father. The other F2 family (PN34) was bred from fish from one F1 family bred in 2001 from a female *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" x male *P.* sp. "nyererei-like". The offspring were pooled into the same aquaria and hence the father is known but not the brood or mother. When F2 offspring were large enough, they were PIT-tagged and pooled into the same aquaria. The breeding set-up is given in the electronic supplementary material, figure S1.

All females had been brooded in the mouth of their mothers until independently feeding and were then raised apart from their mothers. In the data analyses we have included all spawning wild type and F1 females and the 69 F2 females with ≥5 spawning decisions in the experiment. Spawning decisions of females with ≤4 spawning decisions are given in the electronic supplementary material (figure S3 and table S1) and were also used in the calculations of paternal and brood effects.

Mate choice

Mate choice was tested using a "partial partition" design [24]. An aquarium measuring L 600 cm x W 80 cm x H 40 cm was divided into ten equally-sized compartments by plastic grids, 8 containing one male each, 4 of each species. Identical halved flower pots (D = 270 mm, L = 220 mm) served as the focal point in male territories. Two chambers were accessible to females only. We used several males of each species to decrease the chance that effects of individual variation in male attractiveness could override female mating preferences for males of one species or the other. The mesh size of the plastic grids was adjusted to confine males in their compartments, but to allow the smaller females to pass through. The complement of males was replaced every second month and the female-only compartments were relocated. In total, 11 wild caught and 8 lab-bred *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" males and 11 wild caught and 6 laboratory-bred *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" males were used in the experiment (Electronic supplementary material table S3). Wild type females were tested as a control that species-specific mating preferences would be expressed in this setup. All females were tested with wild type males; hybrid males were not used in these experiments.

To test whether experience altered mating preferences, 16 F2 hybrid females that had spawned 6 broods each and whose preferences were hence known were isolated in a tank with

a male of the non-preferred species. The 5 *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like"-preferring females had spawned 90-100% with *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" (mean= 98 %), and the 11 *P.* sp. "nyererei-like"-preferring females had spawned 83 –100% with *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" (mean= 96 %). The females that subsequently spawned with a male of the species they had not preferred (N=9) were allowed to brood fry until final release and potential independence of the fry. Thereafter, they were released back into the experimental tank and allowed to spawn again with a choice of males.

All experimental fish were marked with PIT tags and a small piece of the dorsal fin was cut to provide a DNA sample. Females with eggs were placed in a separate aquarium until the eggs hatched. All larvae/juveniles were euthanized using MS-222 (tricaine methanesulfonate) and stored in 95% ethanol prior to paternity analyses. All females were released back into the experimental tank after handling.

Paternity analyses

The experiment lasted 2.5 years. Five embryos from each brood were genotyped at 2-5 microsatellite loci, Ppun5, Ppun7, Pun17, Ppun21 and Ppun32. Methods for DNA extraction and PCR reactions were as described previously [33] with additional optimizations for multiplex analyses. The amplified DNA samples were genotyped on a Beckman Coulter CEQ 8000 capillary sequencer. Genotypes were received from the CEQ 8000 Series Genetic Analysing System 8.0.52. Paternities were determined by direct inspection of the allele size estimates on a spreadsheet, and males that possessed two alleles in a microsatellite locus that were not present in the offspring were excluded as a possible father (electronic supplementary material, tables S1-S4). We used the number of spawning decisions in figures and statistical calculations i.e. if a brood was confirmed to be fathered by more than one male each male was

considered to be a spawning decision. F2 females in the analysed data had 4-8 broods each and 5-15 spawning decisions. The complete datasets of the wild type females, F1 hybrid females, F2 hybrid females and the males used in the experiment are included in the electronic supplementary material, figures S2-S3 and tables S1-S3. We also provide pictures of the F2 males from PN1-33 in figure S4.

Statistics

When analysing between-group preferences (*P.* sp. "pundamilia-like vs. *P.* sp. "nyererei-like"; F1 hybrid females with *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" mother vs. F1 hybrid females with *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" mother), we, for each female, subtracted the number of spawning decisions with males of *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" from the number of spawning decisions with males of *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" and analysed the differences with Mann Whitney U-tests.

Within-group preferences were analysed with Wilcoxon signed ranks tests on the individual's number of spawning decisions with *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" and *P.* sp. "nyererei-like". In one F1 hybrid family, a binomial test was used due to the low number of spawning decisions per female. The preference of individual F2 hybrid females were also analysed with binomial tests. We could not estimate individual female preferences of wild type and F1 hybrid females given the small number of decisions obtained from each female.

To test whether the F2 hybrid female spawning patterns deviated significantly from random, we simulated a distribution of spawning decisions of the 69 females that had ≥ 5 spawning decisions with either a *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" (*Pp*) or a *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" (*Pn*) male. To express the level of deviation from randomness, we calculated the consistency of an

individual's mate choice and calculated the repeatability (R) of a female's spawning decisions. In quantitative genetics, the repeatability can be used to determine the upper-bound estimate of the broad sense heritability ($H^2 = V_G/V_P$) [p. 136-138, 37]. The broad sense heritability indicates the relative proportion of total phenotypic variation of a trait (V_P) that has a genetic basis (V_G). Repeatability is an upper-bound estimate of this heritability, given that similarity in a trait value (in this case, consistent preference for males of one of the two species) can both have a genetic and an environmental basis (e.g. a given female may prefer males of a given species due to previous experiences). The model assesses the extent to which a female's first spawning decision can predict her subsequent decisions, as this informs us on how strong a mate preference has been expressed. In other words, the model assesses how significantly the pattern of spawning decisions deviates from a random pattern (i.e. no preference) when analysed across all F2 females at the population level. In the simulations, each female is given a probability of mating with a *Pp* or a *Pn* male equivalent to the proportion of *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" and *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" spawning decisions observed. This probability determines her first spawning decision. However, once a female has been allocated a mate preference, the strength with which this preference continues to affect subsequent spawning decisions is given by the following formulae:

$$P(x_i = Pp) = Pp + R(1 - Pp)$$

$$P(x_i = Pn) = Pn + R(1 - Pn)$$

Here, $P(x_i = Pp)$ and $P(x_i = Pn)$ are the probabilities of spawning with a *Pp* and a *Pn* male at the i^{th} spawning decision ($i > 1$), and *Pp* and *Pn* are the observed proportions of spawning decisions (across the entire population) with a *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" and a *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" male, respectively. R is the repeatability coefficient ($0 \leq R \leq 1$). With R=0,

spawning is "random" and proportional to the observed proportion of *Pn* and *Pp* spawning decisions. In this case, female choice will switch randomly between *Pp* and *Pn* males. With *R*=1, however, spawning choice is fixed and all spawning decisions are for males of the same species as the first choice. In this case, females will consistently choose either a *Pp* or a *Pn* male. With intermediate values of *R*, there is a preference for a species of male, but this preference will not completely determine a spawning decision.

Furthermore, we also calculated if the number of individuals with preference for one species differed from random. When categorizing female preference for males of either one of the two species we used binomial tests and $\alpha = 0.05$ for the data set that included females with ≥6 spawning decisions.

To address potential parental and brood effects, all 100 F2 females were divided into two categories: majority of spawnings with *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" and majority of spawnings with *P.* sp. "nyererei-like". Four females were omitted because they spawned equally many times with males of the two species leaving 96 females (see the electronic supplementary material figure S3). We used Binomial tests to ask if the female offspring of each of the three F1 fathers were biased in their spawning decisions towards one of the two species, and χ^2 to test if there was a difference between F2 females fathered by different F1 males. When analysing the brood effect we restricted the analyses to the 9 broods with ≥4 F2 females and performed 36 pairwise Fisher exact test comparisons and Bonferroni correction to correct for multiple comparisons.

Statistics were performed in SPSS v. 23. The individual-based model was constructed in Minitab 12.1.

Ethics

This work was ethically reviewed and performed under a UK Government Home Office Licence (PPL 60/3295).

Results

Wild type females spawned with their own species

There was a significant difference in spawning decisions between females of the two species (Mann Whitney U test, n = 20, U = 0.00, p <0.001, the electronic supplementary material figure S2a). The *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" females had 1-3 spawning decisions each (median 2), and 14 out of 15 spawned only with conspecific males. One female mated once with *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" and twice with conspecific males (Wilcoxon signed ranks test T = 0, n = 15, p <0.001). The *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" females also had 1-3 spawning decisions each (median 3), and all 6 spawned only with conspecific males (Wilcoxon signed ranks test T = 0, n = 6, p = 0.024).

F1 hybrid females generally spawned with the species of their mother

There was a significant difference in spawning decisions between the two F1 hybrid families (Mann Whitney U test, n = 16, U = 2.50, p = 0.002, the electronic supplementary material figure S2b). This was caused by F1 hybrid females spawning more often with the species of their mothers (*P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" mother, 2-3 spawning decisions per female, median 2; 2 females spawned with both species, 9 with *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" only, N = 11, Wilcoxon signed ranks test, z = 45, p = 0.004, *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" mother, 1 spawning decision each, all spawned with *P.* sp. "nyererei-like", two tailed Binomial test, n = 5, p = 0.063).

318 *F2 hybrid spawning consistency suggests innate mating preference*

319 When including females with ≥6 spawning decisions and α=0.05, 41 out of 59 F2 hybrid
320 females had a significant preference for males of one of the two species, whereas we would
321 have expected <3 if females mated randomly (Fisher exact test, p<0.001; figure 1). The
322 simulation model showed that the pattern of spawning decisions significantly deviated from a
323 random pattern when analysed at the population level. Spawning preferences segregated in an
324 almost Mendelian fashion and the majority of the females repeatedly spawned with one of the
325 two species (figure 1). The model estimates a repeatability of spawning decisions of R=0.7
326 (figure 2), which indicates that in our F2 population, 70% of the variation in spawning
327 decisions is explained by actual female mate preference.
328
329 To address potential parental effects, all 100 F2 hybrid females (the electronic supplementary
330 material figure S3) were divided into two categories: majority of spawnings with *P.* sp.
331 "pundamilia-like" and majority of spawnings with *P.* sp. "nyererei-like". The female
332 offspring of the 3 F1 hybrid males were not significantly biased towards preferring either of
333 the two species (16:27, 12:16 and 11:14, Binomial tests p=0.072, p=0.57 and p=0.69) and
334 there was no difference in ratios between the offspring of the 3 males (χ^2=0.384, df=2,
335 p=0.82). The experimental design of the present study did not allow us to confidently rule out
336 that females from different broods differed in preferences, because most broods were small.
337 However, the data rule out a general maternal effect. When restricting the analyses to broods
338 with ≥4 females, 4 out of 36 pairwise comparisons between broods yield p<0.05 with the
339 lowest p being p=0.015. All these are far from significant when correcting for multiple
340 comparisons. Furthermore, while their F2 hybrid brothers show considerable colour
341 segregation within broods, there is no indication of a strong correlation between a female's

preference and the colour phenotype of her brothers (electronic supplementary material figures S3-S4).

There is no sign of copying of previous choice

Only 26 out of the 69 F2 hybrid females with ≥ 5 spawning decisions spawned with both species. Of those females, 21 switched back and forth between species (figure 1). This demonstrates that females do not simply copy their first mate choice or their most recent choice. In other words, the high repeatability of mate choice decision is unlikely to be the result of copying a previous choice.

Six of the 16 F2 hybrid females with a significant mating preference, which were enclosed with a male of the non-preferred species, did not spawn at all, and one female that did spawn, did not spawn again when reintroduced to the large choice experiment tank. The nine females that had spawned in the no-choice situation against their preference and subsequently spawned again in the choice experiment, all reverted to spawning with males of the previously preferred species (*P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" preferring N=3, *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" preferring N=6, Two tailed Binomial test $p = 0.004$) which highlights the innate strength of female mate preference.

Discussion

The genetics of female mate preferences is likely to affect evolutionary processes, including speciation and hybridisation between species. We report a long term common garden study where we followed spawning decisions of F2 hybrid females between two sympatric sister species throughout a large part of their reproductive lives. Specifically, we examined if mate preferences were consistently maintained across many reproductive cycles which included

mouth-brooding and egg maturation. In addition, we also estimated spawning preferences of F1 hybrid females. Wild type females of both species were used as a control.

Using molecular paternity testing, our experiments indicated that wild-type females mostly mated with conspecific males, although mating was not 100% assortative. This is consistent with the results of previous studies on the same population using mating experiments [30] or behavioural preference assays [9, 30, 42, 43], and indicates that either method can be used reliably to estimate preferences. The occasional disassortative mating is also consistent with modelling based on population genomic data suggesting ongoing gene flow between the same sympatric species in nature, as well as between allopatric populations [19].

All F1 hybrid females mated with their maternal species, although a couple of them also mated with the paternal species. This bias towards the maternal species is consistent with an effect of imprinting, which had previously been demonstrated in Lake Victoria haplochromines using controlled cross-fostering experiments with mate preferences assayed with a behavioural choice test [44, 45]. Our results are, however, also consistent with the possibility that genes influencing species-specific preferences were not entirely reciprocally fixed between the wild-type individuals used to breed our F1 hybrids, e.g. as a result of occasional introgression [19, 26]. It is not impossible that one of the parents of our two test F1 families may have been heterozygous at a mate preference locus, and that thus some of the F1 hybrid females were homozygous.

By contrast, the experimental design limited the potential for any imprinting of species-specific preferences in F2 hybrids, since their mothers were all F1 hybrids. Furthermore, we found that siblings in most families exhibited consistent preferences for males of different

392 species, which is inconsistent with imprinting. Likewise, our experimental test of the
393 preferences of females following a 'no-choice' mating with the non-preferred male species
394 indicated that females retained their original preferences in a subsequent free choice
395 experiment, suggesting that experience did not disrupt their innate preferences. In general,
396 many F2 hybrid females were consistent in choosing males of a particular species, with 41 out
397 of 59 females showing a significant preference, far more than the 3 expected if females had
398 mated by chance. This clear nearly Mendelian segregation in spawning preferences in the F2
399 generation is consistent with previous behavioural choice tests by Haesler and Seehausen [9].
400 The Mendelian segregation despite incomplete genetic isolation and recombination [17, 19,
401 26] in this species pair in the wild implies that species-specific female mate choice among the
402 *Pundamilia* sister species is influenced by relatively few major genes or genomic regions
403 containing several tightly linked loci.
404
405 **Repeatability and the heritability of mate choice**
406 Our simulation indicated that the distribution of spawning decisions over F2 hybrid females
407 deviated significantly from expectations if mating was random when analysed at the
408 population level. A large excess of females showed a significant preference for males of either
409 one of the two species. Female choice of certain type of males within a species often has low
410 repeatability and is subject to change depending on e.g. experience, age, condition, mate
411 copying and the environment [46-48]. In our experiment, repeatability of spawning decisions
412 of F2 hybrid females was high (70 %) and preferences did not change over time and over
413 successive reproductive cycles of females, nor after the experience of a successful spawning
414 event with a male of the non-preferred species. Repeatability is also often used to determine
415 the upper-bound estimate of the broad sense heritability (H^2) in behavioural studies [46, 47].
416 The results from our simulation therefore suggest that up to 70% of the variation in spawning

417 decisions observed among the F2 hybrid females may have a heritable basis. However, the
418 remaining 30% could simply be due to lack of a consistent preference in the class of
419 preference heterozygote F2 hybrid females – these are expected to mate randomly [9].
420 Therefore, heritability may be higher than the estimated 70% [9, 49]. In the experimental
421 design, we aimed to minimize environmental variation introduced by differences in condition
422 between males by providing a choice among eight males, four of each species in each trial.
423 Differences in territory quality were unlikely in the standardised conditions of our experiment.
424 Thus, we conclude that the observed among-female variation in preference is likely to be due
425 to genetic factors.
426
427 **Sexual isolation by mate choice**
428 Behavioural reproductive isolation is of key importance to understanding the rapid evolution
429 of genetically differentiated sympatric species [1, 41, 50], such as those in African cichlid fish
430 radiations. The species pair that we studied here has been estimated to have arisen in just
431 slightly more than 150 generations, facilitated by hybridisation between the local *P.*
432 *pundamilia* and migrants of *P. nyererei* from around Makobe island [19].
433
434 Theoretical work suggests that it is easier for divergent selection to overcome homogenizing
435 gene flow if traits under divergent selection are due to relatively few genes, because the fewer
436 genes that are responsible for a trait under divergent selection, the higher are the selection
437 coefficients for each locus [51-53]. Behavioural courtship traits involved in reproductive
438 isolation are often, but not always, mediated by few loci with major effects, at least in the
439 well-studied *Drosophila* [54]. The male trait (red dorsum vs. blue colour) that species-
440 assortative female mating preferences are based on in the species pair of the present study
441 [30] is likely oligogenic itself [31]. Hence, the genetic architecture of behavioural mate choice

and mating traits in *Pundamilia* may facilitate speciation in the face of gene flow, perhaps in combination with other selection pressures, as might be generated by adaptation to divergent microhabitats, particularly water depths: field studies have shown that red dorsum males tend to be found in deeper water than the blue males [26].

Candidate genes for mate choice

Candidate genes relating to species-specific mate preferences are likely to include those affecting vision. Divergence has been shown in the long wavelength sensitive opsin gene (*LWS*) [26]. In the red vs. blue species pair at Makobe Island, there is also divergence in the short wavelength sensitive opsin gene (*SWS2A*) but this is not currently known in the species pair of the present study [26]. At Makobe Island, there is also divergence in other putative coding regions [18], some of which may be related to vision.

Many small genomic 'islands of differentiation' were found to differentiate *P. pundamilia* and *P. nyererei* from Makobe Island [18]. However, the Python Island species pair having recently (around 150 generations ago) re-emerged after a period of massive introgression might be expected to be divergent at fewer regions, more directly related to divergent selection pressures, which should make traits directly related to reproductive isolation easier to detect. Malinsky et al. [55] identified several genomic regions with high differentiation in two young ecomorphs of crater lake haplochromine cichlids (genus *Astatotilapia)* with partial assortative mating. Candidate adaptive genes in these so called 'genomic islands of differentiation' included rhodopsin and other twilight-vision-associated genes. Differentiation in such 'islands' can resist ongoing gene flow, as shown in < 150 year old incipient *Gasterosteus* stickleback species pairs in two Swiss lakes [56, 57].

467 **To conclude**

468 We show in a common garden long term mating experiment that strong female mating
469 preferences for males of either one of two sister species are recovered in large fractions of the
470 F2 hybrid generation. The genetic assays of mate choice in F2 hybrids between *P.* sp.
471 "pundamilia-like" and *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" show high repeatability and consistency in
472 female choice across many reproductive cycles, and we argue that the variation is influenced
473 by the segregation of a few genes with large effects. We propose that a simple genetic basis
474 could help facilitate stable phenotypic differentiation in sympatry in the face of gene flow.
475

476 **Data accessibility**

477 The complete datasets of the wild type, F1 and F2 females, and the males used in the
478 experiment are included in figure 1 and the electronic supplementary material, figures S2-S3
479 and table S1-S4. The raw data in the electronic supplementary material, tables S1-S4 are also
480 available from the Dryad Digital Repository http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.q58hr [58]. The
481 Minitab 12.1 macro to test the repeatability of mate choice is deposited at GitHub
482 https://github.com/Ward9250/FishSpawn
483
484

485 **Authors' contribution**

486 G.F.T. and O.Se. conceived the project, O.Sv., G.F.T. and O.Se. designed the experiments,
487 K.W. and A.S. carried out the crosses, O.Sv., K.W. and A.S. performed the experiments,
488 O.Sv. carried out microsatellite paternity analyses and processed the data, C.v.O. wrote the
489 simulation model, O.Sv. and C.v.O. analysed the data, O.Sv. wrote the manuscript with
490 important contribution from C.v.O, G.F.T. and O.Se. All authors have provided critical
491 revision of the manuscript and approved the final version.

492

493 **Competing interest**

494 We declare no competing interest

495

496 **Funding**

497 This project was funded by a BBSRC Standard Grant G20313 (to G.F.T and O.Se).

498 Additional support (to O.Sv.) were provided by University of Gothenburg and the Linnaeus

499 Centre for Marine Evolutionary Biology at the University of Gothenburg

500 (http://www.cemeb.science.gu.se), and to C.v.O. by the Earth and Life Systems Alliance

501 (ELSA), Norwich Research Park, UK.

502

503 **Acknowledgements**

504 We are grateful for the essential help in the aquarium facility and genetic laboratory from Bill

505 Hutchinson, Domino Joyce, Paul Nichols, Michele Pierotti, Noel Wreathall and Helen

506 Wilcock. Joana Meier commented on the manuscript. The manuscript was also greatly

507 improved by the helpful comments from the editor and two anonymous reviewers.

508

509 **References**

510

511 1. Coyne J.A., Orr H.A. 2004 *Speciation*. Sunderland, Sinauer.

512 2. Nosil P. 2012 *Ecological Speciation*. Oxford, Oxford University Press; 280 p.

513 3. Arnegard M.E., Kondrashov A.S. 2004 Sympatric speciation by sexual selection

514 alone is unlikely. *Evolution* **58**, 222-237. (doi:10.1111/j.0014-3820.2004.tb01640.x).

4. Doebeli M. 2005 Adaptive speciation when assortative mating is based on female preference for male marker traits. *J Evol Biol* **18**, 1587-1600. (doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2005.00897.x).

5. Lande R. 1981 Models of speciation by sexual selection on polygenic traits. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **78**, 3721-3725. (doi:10.1073/pnas.78.6.3721).

6. Higashi M., Takimoto G., Yamamura N. 1999 Sympatric speciation by sexual selection. *Nature* **402**, 523-526. (doi:10.1038/990087).

7. Kawata M., Shoji A., Kawamura S., Seehausen O. 2007 A genetically explicit model of speciation by sensory drive within a continuous population in aquatic environments. *BMC Evol Biol* **7**, 99. (doi:10.1186/1471-2148-7-99).

8. Thibert-Plante X., Gavrilets S. 2013 Evolution of mate choice and the so-called magic traits in ecological speciation. *Ecol Lett* **16**, 1004-1013. (doi:10.1111/ele.12131).

9. Haesler M.P., Seehausen O. 2005 Inheritance of female mating preference in a sympatric sibling species pair of Lake Victoria cichlids: implications for speciation. *Proc R Soc B* **272**, 237-245.

10. Kronforst M.R., Young L.G., Kapan D.D., McNeely C., O'Neill R.J., Gilbert L.E. 2006 Linkage of butterfly mate preference and wing color preference cue at the genomic location of wingless. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **103**, 6575-6580. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0509685103).

11. Merrill R.M., Van Schooten B., Scott J.A., Jiggins C.D. 2011 Pervasive genetic associations between traits causing reproductive isolation in *Heliconius* butterflies. *Proc R Soc Lond, Ser B: Biol Sci* **278**, 511-518. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2010.1493).

12. Ding B., Daugherty D.W., Husemann M., Chen M., Howe A.E., Danley P.D. 2014 Quantitative genetic analyses of male color pattern and female mate choice in a pair of

539 cichlid fishes of Lake Malawi, East Africa. *Plos One* **9**. (doi:e114798
540 10.1371/journal.pone.0114798).
541 13. Diao W.W., Mousset M., Horsburgh G.J., Vermeulen C.J., Johannes F., van de
542 Zande L., Ritchie M.G., Schmitt T., Beukeboom L.W. 2016 Quantitative trait locus analysis
543 of mating behavior and male sex pheromones in *Nasonia* wasps. *G3-Genes Genomes Genet* **6**,
544 1549-1562. (doi:10.1534/g3.116.029074).
545 14. Laturney M., Moehring A.J. 2012 Fine-scale genetic analysis of species-specific
546 female preference in *Drosophila simulans*. *J Evol Biol* **25**, 1718-1731. (doi:10.1111/j.1420-
547 9101.2012.02550.x).
548 15. Oh K.P., Fergus D.J., Grace J.L., Shaw K.L. 2012 Interspecific genetics of
549 speciation phenotypes: song and preference coevolution in Hawaiian crickets. *J Evol Biol* **25**,
550 1500-1512. (doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2012.02531.x).
551 16. Maan M.E., Seehausen O. 2010 Mechanisms of species divergence through
552 visual adaptation and sexual selection: Perspectives from a cichlid model system. *Curr Zool*
553 **56**, 285-299.
554 17. Seehausen O. 2009 Progressive levels of trait divergence along a 'speciation
555 transect' in the Lake Victoria cichlid fish *Pundamilia*. In *Ecological Reviews: Speciation and*
556 *Patterns of Diversity* (eds. Butlin R., Bridle J., Schluter D.), pp. 155-176. Cambridge,
557 Cambridge University Press.
558 18. Brawand D., Wagner C.E., Li Y.I., Malinsky M., Keller I., Fan S., Simakov O.,
559 Ng A.Y., Lim Z.W., Bezault E., et al. 2014 The genomic substrate for adaptive radiation in
560 African cichlid fish. *Nature* **513**, 375-381. (doi:10.1038/nature13726).
561 19. Meier J.I., Sousa V.C., Marques D.A., Selz O.M., Excoffier L., Seehausen O.
562 2016 Demographic modeling of whole genome data reveals parallel origin of similar

Pundamilia cichlid species after hybridization. *Mol Ecol* **Epub ahead of print**. (doi:10.1111/mec.13838. Epub ahead of print).

20. Seehausen O. 1996 *Lake Victoria rock cichlids - taxonomy, ecology and distribution*. Zevenhuizen, Verduijn Cichlids; 304 p.

21. Andersson M. 1994 *Sexual selection*. Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press.

22. Seehausen O. 2006 African cichlid fish: a model system in adaptive radiation research. *Proc R Soc Lond, Ser B: Biol Sci* **273**, 1987-1998. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2006.3539).

23. Selz O.M., Thommen R., Pierotti M.E.R., Anaya-Rojas J.M., Seehausen O. 2016 Differences in male coloration are predicted by divergent sexual selection between populations of a cichlid fish. *Proc R Soc Lond, Ser B: Biol Sci* **283**. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.0172).

24. Knight M.E., Turner G.F. 2004 Laboratory mating trials indicate incipient speciation by sexual selection among populations of the cichlid fish *Pseudotropheus zebra* from Lake Malawi. *Proc R Soc B* **271**, 675-680. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2003.2639).

25. Kidd M.R., Danley P.D., Kocher T.D. 2006 A direct assay of female choice in cichlids: all the eggs in one basket. *J Fish Biol* **68**, 373-384. (doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2005.00896.x).

26. Seehausen O., Terai Y., Magalhaes I.S., Carleton K.L., Mrosso H.D.J., Miyagi R., van der Sluijs I., Schneider M.V., Maan M.E., Tachida H., et al. 2008 Speciation through sensory drive in cichlid fish. *Nature* **455**, 620-U623. (doi:10.1038/nature07285).

27. Blows M.W., Brooks R., Kraft P.G. 2003 Exploring complex fitness surfaces: Multiple ornamentation and polymorphism in male guppies. *Evolution* **57**, 1622-1630.

586 28. Brooks R., Hunt J., Blows M.W., Smith M.J., Bussiere L.F., Jennions M.D.
587 2005 Experimental evidence for multivariate stabilizing sexual selection. *Evolution* **59**, 871-
588 880. (doi:10.1111/j.0014-3820.2005.tb01760.x).
589 29. Candolin U. 2003 The use of multiple cues in mate choice. *Biol Rev* **78**, 575-
590 595.
591 30. Selz O.M., Pierotti M.E.R., Maan M.E., Schmid C., Seehausen O. 2014 Female
592 preference for male color is necessary and sufficient for assortative mating in 2 cichlid sister
593 species *Behav Ecol* **25**, 612-626. (doi:10.1093/beheco/aru024).
594 31. Magalhães I.S., Seehausen O. 2010 Genetics of male nuptial colour divergence
595 between sympatric sister species of a Lake Victoria cichlid fish. *J Evol Biol* **23**, 914-924.
596 32. Seehausen O., vanAlphen J.J.M., Witte F. 1997 Cichlid fish diversity threatened
597 by eutrophication that curbs sexual selection. *Science* **277**, 1808-1811.
598 33. Stelkens R.B., Pierotti M.E.R., Joyce D.A., Smith A.M., van der Sluijs I.,
599 Seehausen O. 2008 Disruptive sexual selection on male nuptial coloration in an experimental
600 hybrid population of cichlid fish. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond, Ser B: Biol Sci* **363**, 2861-2870.
601 (doi:10.1098/rstb.2008.0049).
602 34. Barson N.J., Knight M.E., Turner G.F. 2007 The genetic architecture of male
603 colour differences between a sympatric Lake Malawi cichlid species pair. *J Evol Biol* **20**, 45-
604 53. (doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2006.01228.x).
605 35. Svensson O., Egger B., Gricar B., Woodhouse K., van Oosterhout C.,
606 Salzburger W., Seehausen O., Turner G. 2011 Segregation of species-specific male
607 attractiveness in F2 hybrid Lake Malawi cichlid fish. *Int J Evol Biol* **2011**, 1-7.
608 (doi:10.4061/2011/426179).
609 36. van der Sluijs I., Dijkstra P.D., Lindeyer C.M., Visser B., Smith A.M.,
610 Groothuis T.G.G., van Alphen J.J.M., Seehausen O. 2013 A test of genetic association among

611 male nuptial coloration, female mating preference, and male aggression bias within a
612 polymorphic population of cichlid fish. *Curr Zool* **59**, 221-229.
613 37. Falconer D.S., Mackay T.F.C. 1996 *Introduction to Quantitative Genetics*. 4 ed.
614 Harlow, Essex, UK, Pearson Education Limited; 480 p.
615 38. Lande R. 1981 The minimum number of genes contributing to quantitative
616 variation between and within populations. *Genetics* **99**, 541-553.
617 39. Turelli M., Barton N.H. 1994 Genetic and statistical analyses of strong selection
618 on polygenic traits: what, me normal? *Genetics* **138**, 913-941.
619 40. Felsenstein J. 1981 Skepticism towards Santa Rosalia, or why are there so few
620 kinds of animals? *Evolution* **35**, 124-138. (doi:10.2307/2407946).
621 41. Smadja C.M., Butlin R.K. 2011 A framework for comparing processes of
622 speciation in the presence of gene flow. *Mol Ecol* **20**, 5123-5140. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-
623 294X.2011.05350.x).
624 42. Seehausen O., van Alphen J.J.M. 1998 The effect of male coloration on female
625 mate choice in closely related Lake Victoria cichlids (*Haplochromis nyererei* complex).
626 *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* **42**, 1-8.
627 43. van der Sluijs I., Van Dooren T.J.M., Hofker K.D., van Alphen J.J.M., Stelkens
628 R.B., Seehausen O. 2008 Female mating preference functions predict sexual selection against
629 hybrids between sibling species of cichlid fish. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond, Ser B: Biol Sci* **363**,
630 2871-2877. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2008.0045).
631 44. Verzijden M.N., Korthof R.E.M., ten Cate C. 2008 Females learn from mothers
632 and males learn from others. The effect of mother and siblings on the development of female
633 mate preferences and male aggression biases in Lake Victoria cichlids, genus *Mbipia*. *Behav*
634 *Ecol Sociobiol* **62**, 1359-1368. (doi:10.1007/s00265-008-0564-x).

635 45. Verzijden M.N., ten Cate C. 2007 Early learning influences species assortative
636 mating preferences in Lake Victoria cichlid fish. *Biol Lett* **3**, 134-136.
637 46. Jennions M.D., Petrie M. 1997 Variation in mate choice and mating preferences:
638 A review of causes and consequences. *Biol Rev* **72**, 283-327.
639 (doi:10.1017/s0006323196005014).
640 47. Bell A.M., Hankison S.J., Laskowski K.L. 2009 The repeatability of behaviour:
641 a meta-analysis. *Anim Behav* **77**, 771-783. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2008.12.022).
642 48. Brooks R. 1996 Copying and the repeatability of mate choice. *Behav Ecol*
643 *Sociobiol* **39**, 323-329. (doi:10.1007/s002650050296).
644 49. Dohm M.R. 2002 Repeatability estimates do not always set an upper limit to
645 heritability. *Funct Ecol* **16**, 273-280.
646 50. Servedio M.R. 2016 Geography, assortative mating, and the effects of sexual
647 selection on speciation with gene flow. *Evol Appl* **9**, 91-102. (doi:10.1111/eva.12296).
648 51. Gavrilets S., Vose A. 2005 Dynamic patterns of adaptive radiation. *Proc Natl*
649 *Acad Sci USA* **102**, 18040-18045. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0506330102).
650 52. Yeaman S., Otto S.P. 2011 Establishment and maintenance of adaptive genetic
651 divergence under migration, selection, and drift. *Evolution* **65**, 2123-2129.
652 (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2011.01277.x).
653 53. Yeaman S., Whitlock M.C. 2011 The genetic architecture of adaptation under
654 migration-selection balance. *Evolution* **65**, 1897-1911. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-
655 5646.2011.01269.x).
656 54. Arbuthnott D. 2009 The genetic architecture of insect courtship behavior and
657 premating isolation. *Heredity* **103**, 15-22. (doi:10.1038/hdy.2009.22).
658 55. Malinsky M., Challis R.J., Tyers A.M., Schiffels S., Terai Y., Ngatunga B.P.,
659 Miska E.A., Durbin R., Genner M.J., Turner G.F. 2015 Genomic islands of speciation

660 separate cichlid ecomorphs in an East African crater lake. *Science* **350**, 1493-1498.
661 (doi:10.1126/science.aac9927).
662 56. Marques D.A., Lucek K., Meier J.I., Mwaiko S., Wagner C.E., Excoffier L.,
663 Seehausen O. 2016 Genomics of rapid incipient speciation in sympatric threespine
664 stickleback. *PLoS Genetics* **12**, e1005887. (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1005887).
665 57. Marques D.A., Lucek K., Haesler M.P., Feller A.F., Meier J.I., Wagner C.E.,
666 Excoffier L., Seehausen O. 2016 Genomic landscape of early ecological speciation initiated
667 by selection on nuptial colour. *Mol Ecol* **Epub ahead of print**. (doi:10.1111/mec.13774).
668 58. Svensson O., Woodhouse K., van Oosterhout C., Smith A., Turner G.F.,
669 Seehausen O. 2017 The genetics of mate preferences in hybrids between two young and
670 sympatric Lake Victoria cichlid species. *Dryad Digital Repository*.
671 (doi:doi:10.5061/dryad.q58hr).
672
673
674

675 **Figure legends**

676

677

678 **Figure 1.** Individual spawning decisions by the 69 F2 hybrid females. Spawning decisions
679 were determined by microsatellite DNA paternity analyses. Above the line y=0 is the number
680 of spawning decisions with *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like", and below the line is the number of
681 spawning decisions with *P.* sp. "nyererei-like". The order of spawning decisions is arranged
682 with the first spawning on the top, and the last on the bottom with a spawning decision with
683 *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like", marked in blue and a spawning decision with *P.* sp. "nyererei-like"
684 marked in red. *$p<0.05$, [a]$0.05<p<0.1$.

685

686

687 **Figure 2**. (A) Simulated (means and 5-95% error bars) spawning decisions of F2 hybrid
688 females with *P.* sp. "pundamilia-like" (blue dots), and with *P.* sp. "nyererei-like" (red dots)
689 based on a repeatability of an individual's spawning decision of R=0.7. Observed ratio of
690 spawning decisions is shown by the solid black lines. (B) The best fit of the model is with
691 R=0.7, which minimises the mean squares (MS) between the observed and simulated
692 spawning distribution. Lower values of R produce a more random spawning pattern, whilst
693 higher values of R increase the consistency of a females' spawning choices above those
694 observed, which reduced the fit of the model by inflating the MS.


Number of spawning decisions with P. sp. "nyererei-like"
with P. sp. "pundamilia-like"
Order of spawning decisions
10
5
0
5
10
15
*
***
*
*
****
****
aaaa
*
***
a
*
aaa
****
*****
**
***
One spawning decision with P. sp. "pundamilia-like"
One spawning decision with P. sp. "nyererei-like"


Simulated spawning decisions with P. sp. “nyererei python”
Simulated spawning decisions with P. sp. “pundamilia python”
Number of spawning decisions with P. sp. "nyererei-like"
with P. sp. "pundamilia-like"
15
10
5
0
5
10
15
0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 69
F2-female


Model fit (in MS)
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0
Repeatability (R)